

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4, 6 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been presented.

Claims 1 –12 are pending and under consideration.

### OBJECTIONS TO THE TITLE

The Office Action objected to the title because it "is greater than 50-character limit." This rejection is respectfully traversed because MPEP § 606 limits the length of the title to 500 characters, rather than 50 characters as described in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

### OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Office Action objected to the specification due to several informalities. In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to address the objections and it is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

### CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objected to claims 4, 6 and 12 due to informalities. The claims have been amended to address the objections and to clarify the recitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these objections be withdrawn.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 1-12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eisler et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,964,843 ("Eisler"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Eisler fails to disclose at least "converting the received 16 bit dialogue window information to 32 bit dialogue window information" as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action cites col. 12, lines 18-22 of Eisler as anticipating the limitation. Eisler discusses therein the driver initialization function executed by the 32-bit driver creates a 32-bit pointer from the 16-bit pointer."

The pointer discussed in Eisler is potentially used by the 32-bit code to access the same memory that the 16-bit pointer accesses from the 16-bit side. The pointer in Eisler is not

dialogue window information as recited above. In fact, Eisler fails to disclose dialogue window information, either in the cited text or elsewhere.

Eisler also fails to disclose at least "displaying the 32 bit dialogue window corresponding to the converted 32 bit dialogue window information" as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action cites col. 14, lines 42-58 of Eisler as anticipating the limitation. Eisler discusses therein an embodiment "developed for a display device interface used within a display system."

As previously asserted, Eisler fails to disclose dialogue window information. Because Eisler fails to disclose 32-bit dialogue window information as described, it cannot disclose the above-claimed feature. In addition, neither the cited text, nor the remainder of the Eisler reference, discloses the displaying of a dialogue window of any kind. To further illustrate a difference between Eisler and the above-claimed feature, as only example embodiments, FIGS. 3 and 4 of the present application illustrate examples of a dialog window.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by each of the independent claims 4, 8, 9 and 11, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not taught or disclosed by the references, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4, 8, 9 and 11 allowed.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3, 5-7 and 12, which variously depend from independent claims 1, 4 and 11, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 4 and 11, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Eisler fails to disclose at least "displaying the device driver dialogue window regardless of an operating system type" as recited in independent claim 10.

As previously asserted, Eisler fails to disclose a device driver dialogue window. However, even assuming arguendo that Eisler were to disclose the feature, Eisler still fails to disclose displaying the device driver dialogue window regardless of an operating system type. For example, FIG. 4 of Eisler clearly illustrates two distinct bit drivers, 16-bit driver 128 and 32-bit driver 130, interfacing with a display device. Similarly, Eisler discusses the drivers as distinct entities. For example, Eisler, at col. 11, lines 11-15, states "those functions that are not supported by the 32 bit driver are passed to the... 16-bit driver."

The Office Action cites col. 10, lines 54-56 of Eisler as anticipating the above feature. Eisler states therein "[t]he two drivers work closely together and are likely provided as a single driver component." However, even if provided as a single driver component, the drivers in Eisler must remain distinct to function as described in the reference. For example, Eisler states at col. 10, lines 45-51, "the system of the present invention includes some portion of both the 16- and 32-bit drivers" and "little modification is required of the existing drivers." Therefore, Eisler fails to disclose a single user interface that is displayed regardless of the driver being used.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

#### CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 9, 2007

By: 

David J. Cutitta  
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501